

The Sun

MONDAY, JULY 10, 1905.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as Second-Class Matter.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.

DAILY, Per Month	\$0.50
DAILY, Per Year	5.00
SUNDAY, Per Year	2.00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year	6.00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month	.50

Postage to foreign countries added.

Readers who intend to leave town for the summer may have THE SUN mailed to them at the foregoing prices. The address may be changed as is desired. Order through your newsdealer or of THE SUN, 170 Nassau street.

Published by The Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 170 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication wish to have rejected articles returned, they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

The Cotton Report Leak.

Secretary Wilson of the Department of Agriculture refused to believe that there was any truth in the charges against the Bureau of Statistics when they were first called to his attention. The system of handling the cotton report made manipulation or the obtaining of advance information impossible, it was said, and the Southern Cotton Growers' Association, which formulated the accusations, was looked upon as an association bent on airing an unfounded grievance. But it turns out that the association was right, and the Department of Agriculture was sheltering an ugly scandal.

Mr. Wilson unquestionably feels that he was justified in placing implicit confidence in Mr. Hyde, the chief statistician, and HOLMES, the speculative subordinate, was trusted completely, in spite of the fact that his manner of life was extravagantly out of proportion to his salary. Mr. Wilson, in fact, can do little else than trust his subordinates implicitly. His Department includes many bureaus that no layman could manage or understand. A good man placed at the head of one of them will not stay long if he is treated like a scoundrel, and a scoundrel, even though watched closely, will find opportunity to use his position for his own ends.

Many persons regard the crop reporting activities of the Government as scarcely necessary or legitimate. Were it to retire from the field, private agencies would take up the work and perform it satisfactorily. The Government entered upon it in response to the cry "Do something for the farmer!" It is safe to say that the speculators have been benefited more than the farmers by the Government reports. Wheat would still be wheat and cotton cotton if there were no Bureau of Statistics in Washington, and the farmer is not such a fool as some politicians describe him.

The discovery of this serious breach of confidence in what was supposed to be a particularly honest and trustworthy bureau, it may be added, is not exactly a strong argument in favor of increasing the commercial activities indulged in by the Government.

Religion and the Civil Power in France.

As we expected, the French Chamber of Deputies has passed the bill for the separation of Church and State in France by a majority of upward of a hundred, and there is no doubt that the Senate, to which the measure now goes, will concur. We may therefore regard as definitely assured the abolition of the Concordat, which for a century has regulated the relations of the French Government not only to Catholics, but also to Protestants and Jews. That not only the Catholic priests and bishops, but also pastors of the Reformed (Huguenot) Church and Jewish rabbis, have since 1804 received stipends from the State is a fact somewhat overlooked, because of the vast preponderance of the Catholic element in the population of France.

Ostensibly, the abolition of the Concordat will give Catholicism in the French Republic precisely the same position that it occupies in the United States. What we undoubtedly see here is a free Church in a free State, and, nominally, it is a corresponding phenomenon that we are to behold in France. There are some minor differences that have been prescribed to the French Legislature by a sense of equity, and there is a fundamental distinction due to the fact that the structure of the French political system differs in principle from our own. The ministers of religion are not to be cast abruptly on the world to seek from laymen a support which the latter have not been accustomed to give, except indirectly, in their capacity of taxpayers. If, indeed, the Catholic, Protestant and Hebrew laity are as pious in France as they are in the United States they might be trusted to accept with alacrity and cheerfulness their new responsibilities. Some doubt upon this point, however, has been expressed by the clergy themselves, and, assuming that their apprehensions might prove well grounded, the Rouvier Cabinet has mitigated some of the harsh features of the bill as originally framed by M. COMBES.

The ownership of all churches and ecclesiastical buildings by the State is still asserted, but leases of them will be granted to associations locally corresponding to parishes. These units may be grouped to form larger associations, which by lease may acquire the right to occupy cathedrals and other diocesan edifices. Moreover, the stipends hitherto received from the Government will continue to be paid to the existing members of the Catholic priesthood and episcopate, and also, of course, to those Protestant pastors and Jewish rabbis who have been dependent on the treasury for their salaries. No additions to the lists of stipendiaries, however, will be recognized by the State. All new priests, ministers and rabbis will have to look to their congregations for their maintenance. For awhile, therefore, the public worship budget will undergo no material abatement, but as time goes on and the present

generation of the clergy passes away the Government appropriation for religious purposes will shrink to the vanishing point. Then, but not till then, shall we witness in France, so far as the payment of stipends is concerned, that absolute divorce of religion from the civil power with which we are familiar in this country.

From another point of view, however, the situation will be profoundly different. On this side of the Atlantic any form of religion is exempt from police supervision and interference so long as it refrains from violating the State or Federal laws. Islamism might be propagated in our commonwealth with impunity, just as Mormonism is, so long as certain tenets are not reduced to practice. If a votary of either of those religions should be prosecuted it would be as a bigamist, not as a Moslem or a Mormon. That is to say, in the United States the Church is, in deed as well as word, absolutely free. It will be otherwise in France, where for upward of a hundred years has had an intensely centralized and unified form of government which, nominally autonomous, has in practice been paternal. The French have lost what habits of local self-government they ever possessed, and have been accustomed for generations to lean upon the central authority. The demand for incessant interposition renders incessant surveillance necessary, and as a result all Frenchmen, whether dwelling in cities or rural districts, find themselves involved in the meshes of police inspection and control. The "associations" to which Paris churches and cathedrals will be leased for terms of years under specified conditions will be no more exempt than are purely secular combinations from the rigorous provisions of the law concerning all associations. The civil authorities will possess, and, if they choose, may exercise at any moment, an oppressive power of interference and coercion, which may be carried to the point of closing particular churches and cathedrals, on the ground that the terms of the leases have been infringed. A Government inspired by an equitable spirit or desirous of conciliating the pious part of the community would, of course, refrain from applying such pressure; but if a Jacobin or Socialist were Premier the religious "associations" would be likely to feel the weight of his hand.

It is impossible to forecast the outcome of an event which by both its promoters and its opponents is felt to be momentous. As we have formerly pointed out, the members of the French Catholic episcopate, all of whom have been consulted on the subject, take divergent views of the future. The majority of the opinions expressed are pessimistic, and even those which are suffused with optimism seem to be based on the experience of Catholicism in the United States, where, as we have said, the political structure and the political spirit differ essentially from those of France.

Mr. Roosevelt's Memory.

Few hot weather communications to THE SUN have ever surprised us more than this from an esteemed and intelligent friend and reader:

"TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: Please inform your readers why President ROOSEVELT and some other public men, when referring to our national legislature, constantly say 'the Congress.'"

"Many of us when boys in our public schools had to commit a large portion of the Constitution to memory, so as to repeat it offhand, it being a question of credit as to how many pages we could repeat in this manner; so we remember how carefully our learned forefathers defined and wrote 'Congress shall have power,' etc."

"Nowhere does it say 'the Congress.' The British people might as well say 'the Parliament.' 'Congress' is a lofty title in itself, but the words 'the Congress' are not only horrible, but they take away all dignity and character from the greatest legislative body in the world."

"I am sure that 'the Congress' used to be a term of reproach, as C. B. S."

We reply that when President ROOSEVELT uses the term "the Congress" in addressing the Legislative department of the Government, or in referring to it, he shows that his memory has retained the exact language of the Constitution much better than the memory of his critic "C. B. S."

Instead of avoiding the term "the Congress," which "C. B. S." finds horrible and unworthy of the greatest legislative body in the world, the learned forefathers employed it continually and intentionally. Instead of the phrase occurring nowhere in the Constitution, it appears there, "C. B. S." recollection to the contrary notwithstanding, more than two dozen times. In comparatively few places the "the" is omitted. In the great majority of cases it is "the Congress," not "Congress."

ARTICLE I, SECTION 2. "The actual enumeration shall be made within three years after the first meeting of the Congress of the United States."

SECTION 4. "The Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations."

SECTION 4. "The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year."

SECTION 7. "The same shall be a law, in the manner as to how many pages we could repeat in this manner; so we remember how carefully our learned forefathers defined and wrote 'Congress shall have power,' etc."

SECTION 8. "The Congress shall have power, by law, to make or alter such regulations."

SECTION 10. "Without the consent of the Congress."

SECTION 10. "Without the consent of the Congress."

SECTION 10. "Without the consent of the Congress."

SECTION 10. "Without the consent of the Congress."

SECTION 10. "Without the consent of the Congress."

generation of the clergy passes away the Government appropriation for religious purposes will shrink to the vanishing point. Then, but not till then, shall we witness in France, so far as the payment of stipends is concerned, that absolute divorce of religion from the civil power with which we are familiar in this country.

From another point of view, however, the situation will be profoundly different. On this side of the Atlantic any form of religion is exempt from police supervision and interference so long as it refrains from violating the State or Federal laws. Islamism might be propagated in our commonwealth with impunity, just as Mormonism is, so long as certain tenets are not reduced to practice. If a votary of either of those religions should be prosecuted it would be as a bigamist, not as a Moslem or a Mormon. That is to say, in the United States the Church is, in deed as well as word, absolutely free. It will be otherwise in France, where for upward of a hundred years has had an intensely centralized and unified form of government which, nominally autonomous, has in practice been paternal. The French have lost what habits of local self-government they ever possessed, and have been accustomed for generations to lean upon the central authority. The demand for incessant interposition renders incessant surveillance necessary, and as a result all Frenchmen, whether dwelling in cities or rural districts, find themselves involved in the meshes of police inspection and control. The "associations" to which Paris churches and cathedrals will be leased for terms of years under specified conditions will be no more exempt than are purely secular combinations from the rigorous provisions of the law concerning all associations. The civil authorities will possess, and, if they choose, may exercise at any moment, an oppressive power of interference and coercion, which may be carried to the point of closing particular churches and cathedrals, on the ground that the terms of the leases have been infringed. A Government inspired by an equitable spirit or desirous of conciliating the pious part of the community would, of course, refrain from applying such pressure; but if a Jacobin or Socialist were Premier the religious "associations" would be likely to feel the weight of his hand.

It is impossible to forecast the outcome of an event which by both its promoters and its opponents is felt to be momentous. As we have formerly pointed out, the members of the French Catholic episcopate, all of whom have been consulted on the subject, take divergent views of the future. The majority of the opinions expressed are pessimistic, and even those which are suffused with optimism seem to be based on the experience of Catholicism in the United States, where, as we have said, the political structure and the political spirit differ essentially from those of France.

Many persons regard the crop reporting activities of the Government as scarcely necessary or legitimate. Were it to retire from the field, private agencies would take up the work and perform it satisfactorily. The Government entered upon it in response to the cry "Do something for the farmer!" It is safe to say that the speculators have been benefited more than the farmers by the Government reports. Wheat would still be wheat and cotton cotton if there were no Bureau of Statistics in Washington, and the farmer is not such a fool as some politicians describe him.

The discovery of this serious breach of confidence in what was supposed to be a particularly honest and trustworthy bureau, it may be added, is not exactly a strong argument in favor of increasing the commercial activities indulged in by the Government.

As we expected, the French Chamber of Deputies has passed the bill for the separation of Church and State in France by a majority of upward of a hundred, and there is no doubt that the Senate, to which the measure now goes, will concur. We may therefore regard as definitely assured the abolition of the Concordat, which for a century has regulated the relations of the French Government not only to Catholics, but also to Protestants and Jews. That not only the Catholic priests and bishops, but also pastors of the Reformed (Huguenot) Church and Jewish rabbis, have since 1804 received stipends from the State is a fact somewhat overlooked, because of the vast preponderance of the Catholic element in the population of France.

Ostensibly, the abolition of the Concordat will give Catholicism in the French Republic precisely the same position that it occupies in the United States. What we undoubtedly see here is a free Church in a free State, and, nominally, it is a corresponding phenomenon that we are to behold in France. There are some minor differences that have been prescribed to the French Legislature by a sense of equity, and there is a fundamental distinction due to the fact that the structure of the French political system differs in principle from our own. The ministers of religion are not to be cast abruptly on the world to seek from laymen a support which the latter have not been accustomed to give, except indirectly, in their capacity of taxpayers. If, indeed, the Catholic, Protestant and Hebrew laity are as pious in France as they are in the United States they might be trusted to accept with alacrity and cheerfulness their new responsibilities. Some doubt upon this point, however, has been expressed by the clergy themselves, and, assuming that their apprehensions might prove well grounded, the Rouvier Cabinet has mitigated some of the harsh features of the bill as originally framed by M. COMBES.

The ownership of all churches and ecclesiastical buildings by the State is still asserted, but leases of them will be granted to associations locally corresponding to parishes. These units may be grouped to form larger associations, which by lease may acquire the right to occupy cathedrals and other diocesan edifices. Moreover, the stipends hitherto received from the Government will continue to be paid to the existing members of the Catholic priesthood and episcopate, and also, of course, to those Protestant pastors and Jewish rabbis who have been dependent on the treasury for their salaries. No additions to the lists of stipendiaries, however, will be recognized by the State. All new priests, ministers and rabbis will have to look to their congregations for their maintenance. For awhile, therefore, the public worship budget will undergo no material abatement, but as time goes on and the present

generation of the clergy passes away the Government appropriation for religious purposes will shrink to the vanishing point. Then, but not till then, shall we witness in France, so far as the payment of stipends is concerned, that absolute divorce of religion from the civil power with which we are familiar in this country.

From another point of view, however, the situation will be profoundly different. On this side of the Atlantic any form of religion is exempt from police supervision and interference so long as it refrains from violating the State or Federal laws. Islamism might be propagated in our commonwealth with impunity, just as Mormonism is, so long as certain tenets are not reduced to practice. If a votary of either of those religions should be prosecuted it would be as a bigamist, not as a Moslem or a Mormon. That is to say, in the United States the Church is, in deed as well as word, absolutely free. It will be otherwise in France, where for upward of a hundred years has had an intensely centralized and unified form of government which, nominally autonomous, has in practice been paternal. The French have lost what habits of local self-government they ever possessed, and have been accustomed for generations to lean upon the central authority. The demand for incessant interposition renders incessant surveillance necessary, and as a result all Frenchmen, whether dwelling in cities or rural districts, find themselves involved in the meshes of police inspection and control. The "associations" to which Paris churches and cathedrals will be leased for terms of years under specified conditions will be no more exempt than are purely secular combinations from the rigorous provisions of the law concerning all associations. The civil authorities will possess, and, if they choose, may exercise at any moment, an oppressive power of interference and coercion, which may be carried to the point of closing particular churches and cathedrals, on the ground that the terms of the leases have been infringed. A Government inspired by an equitable spirit or desirous of conciliating the pious part of the community would, of course, refrain from applying such pressure; but if a Jacobin or Socialist were Premier the religious "associations" would be likely to feel the weight of his hand.

It is impossible to forecast the outcome of an event which by both its promoters and its opponents is felt to be momentous. As we have formerly pointed out, the members of the French Catholic episcopate, all of whom have been consulted on the subject, take divergent views of the future. The majority of the opinions expressed are pessimistic, and even those which are suffused with optimism seem to be based on the experience of Catholicism in the United States, where, as we have said, the political structure and the political spirit differ essentially from those of France.

Many persons regard the crop reporting activities of the Government as scarcely necessary or legitimate. Were it to retire from the field, private agencies would take up the work and perform it satisfactorily. The Government entered upon it in response to the cry "Do something for the farmer!" It is safe to say that the speculators have been benefited more than the farmers by the Government reports. Wheat would still be wheat and cotton cotton if there were no Bureau of Statistics in Washington, and the farmer is not such a fool as some politicians describe him.

The discovery of this serious breach of confidence in what was supposed to be a particularly honest and trustworthy bureau, it may be added, is not exactly a strong argument in favor of increasing the commercial activities indulged in by the Government.

As we expected, the French Chamber of Deputies has passed the bill for the separation of Church and State in France by a majority of upward of a hundred, and there is no doubt that the Senate, to which the measure now goes, will concur. We may therefore regard as definitely assured the abolition of the Concordat, which for a century has regulated the relations of the French Government not only to Catholics, but also to Protestants and Jews. That not only the Catholic priests and bishops, but also pastors of the Reformed (Huguenot) Church and Jewish rabbis, have since 1804 received stipends from the State is a fact somewhat overlooked, because of the vast preponderance of the Catholic element in the population of France.

Ostensibly, the abolition of the Concordat will give Catholicism in the French Republic precisely the same position that it occupies in the United States. What we undoubtedly see here is a free Church in a free State, and, nominally, it is a corresponding phenomenon that we are to behold in France. There are some minor differences that have been prescribed to the French Legislature by a sense of equity, and there is a fundamental distinction due to the fact that the structure of the French political system differs in principle from our own. The ministers of religion are not to be cast abruptly on the world to seek from laymen a support which the latter have not been accustomed to give, except indirectly, in their capacity of taxpayers. If, indeed, the Catholic, Protestant and Hebrew laity are as pious in France as they are in the United States they might be trusted to accept with alacrity and cheerfulness their new responsibilities. Some doubt upon this point, however, has been expressed by the clergy themselves, and, assuming that their apprehensions might prove well grounded, the Rouvier Cabinet has mitigated some of the harsh features of the bill as originally framed by M. COMBES.

The ownership of all churches and ecclesiastical buildings by the State is still asserted, but leases of them will be granted to associations locally corresponding to parishes. These units may be grouped to form larger associations, which by lease may acquire the right to occupy cathedrals and other diocesan edifices. Moreover, the stipends hitherto received from the Government will continue to be paid to the existing members of the Catholic priesthood and episcopate, and also, of course, to those Protestant pastors and Jewish rabbis who have been dependent on the treasury for their salaries. No additions to the lists of stipendiaries, however, will be recognized by the State. All new priests, ministers and rabbis will have to look to their congregations for their maintenance. For awhile, therefore, the public worship budget will undergo no material abatement, but as time goes on and the present

generation of the clergy passes away the Government appropriation for religious purposes will shrink to the vanishing point. Then, but not till then, shall we witness in France, so far as the payment of stipends is concerned, that absolute divorce of religion from the civil power with which we are familiar in this country.

From another point of view, however, the situation will be profoundly different. On this side of the Atlantic any form of religion is exempt from police supervision and interference so long as it refrains from violating the State or Federal laws. Islamism might be propagated in our commonwealth with impunity, just as Mormonism is, so long as certain tenets are not reduced to practice. If a votary of either of those religions should be prosecuted it would be as a bigamist, not as a Moslem or a Mormon. That is to say, in the United States the Church is, in deed as well as word, absolutely free. It will be otherwise in France, where for upward of a hundred years has had an intensely centralized and unified form of government which, nominally autonomous, has in practice been paternal. The French have lost what habits of local self-government they ever possessed, and have been accustomed for generations to lean upon the central authority. The demand for incessant interposition renders incessant surveillance necessary, and as a result all Frenchmen, whether dwelling in cities or rural districts, find themselves involved in the meshes of police inspection and control. The "associations" to which Paris churches and cathedrals will be leased for terms of years under specified conditions will be no more exempt than are purely secular combinations from the rigorous provisions of the law concerning all associations. The civil authorities will possess, and, if they choose, may exercise at any moment, an oppressive power of interference and coercion, which may be carried to the point of closing particular churches and cathedrals, on the ground that the terms of the leases have been infringed. A Government inspired by an equitable spirit or desirous of conciliating the pious part of the community would, of course, refrain from applying such pressure; but if a Jacobin or Socialist were Premier the religious "associations" would be likely to feel the weight of his hand.

It is impossible to forecast the outcome of an event which by both its promoters and its opponents is felt to be momentous. As we have formerly pointed out, the members of the French Catholic episcopate, all of whom have been consulted on the subject, take divergent views of the future. The majority of the opinions expressed are pessimistic, and even those which are suffused with optimism seem to be based on the experience of Catholicism in the United States, where, as we have said, the political structure and the political spirit differ essentially from those of France.

Many persons regard the crop reporting activities of the Government as scarcely necessary or legitimate. Were it to retire from the field, private agencies would take up the work and perform it satisfactorily. The Government entered upon it in response to the cry "Do something for the farmer!" It is safe to say that the speculators have been benefited more than the farmers by the Government reports. Wheat would still be wheat and cotton cotton if there were no Bureau of Statistics in Washington, and the farmer is not such a fool as some politicians describe him.

The discovery of this serious breach of confidence in what was supposed to be a particularly honest and trustworthy bureau, it may be added, is not exactly a strong argument in favor of increasing the commercial activities indulged in by the Government.

generation of the clergy passes away the Government appropriation for religious purposes will shrink to the vanishing point. Then, but not till then, shall we witness in France, so far as the payment of stipends is concerned, that absolute divorce of religion from the civil power with which we are familiar in this country.

From another point of view, however, the situation will be profoundly different. On this side of the Atlantic any form of religion is exempt from police supervision and interference so long as it refrains from violating the State or Federal laws. Islamism might be propagated in our commonwealth with impunity, just as Mormonism is, so long as certain tenets are not reduced to practice. If a votary of either of those religions should be prosecuted it would be as a bigamist, not as a Moslem or a Mormon. That is to say, in the United States the Church is, in deed as well as word, absolutely free. It will be otherwise in France, where for upward of a hundred years has had an intensely centralized and unified form of government which, nominally autonomous, has in practice been paternal. The French have lost what habits of local self-government they ever possessed, and have been accustomed for generations to lean upon the central authority. The demand for incessant interposition renders incessant surveillance necessary, and as a result all Frenchmen, whether dwelling in cities or rural districts, find themselves involved in the meshes of police inspection and control. The "associations" to which Paris churches and cathedrals will be leased for terms of years under specified conditions will be no more exempt than are purely secular combinations from the rigorous provisions of the law concerning all associations. The civil authorities will possess, and, if they choose, may exercise at any moment, an oppressive power of interference and coercion, which may be carried to the point of closing particular churches and cathedrals, on the ground that the terms of the leases have been infringed. A Government inspired by an equitable spirit or desirous of conciliating the pious part of the community would, of course, refrain from applying such pressure; but if a Jacobin or Socialist were Premier the religious "associations" would be likely to feel the weight of his hand.

It is impossible to forecast the outcome of an event which by both its promoters and its opponents is felt to be momentous. As we have formerly pointed out, the members of the French Catholic episcopate, all of whom have been consulted on the subject, take divergent views of the future. The majority of the opinions expressed are pessimistic, and even those which are suffused with optimism seem to be based on the experience of Catholicism in the United States, where, as we have said, the political structure and the political spirit differ essentially from those of France.

Many persons regard the crop reporting activities of the Government as scarcely necessary or legitimate. Were it to retire from the field, private agencies would take up the work and perform it satisfactorily. The Government entered upon it in response to the cry "Do something for the farmer!" It is safe to say that the speculators have been benefited more than the farmers by the Government reports. Wheat would still be wheat and cotton cotton if there were no Bureau of Statistics in Washington, and the farmer is not such a fool as some politicians describe him.

The discovery of this serious breach of confidence in what was supposed to be a particularly honest and trustworthy bureau, it may be added, is not exactly a strong argument in favor of increasing the commercial activities indulged in by the Government.

As we expected, the French Chamber of Deputies has passed the bill for the separation of Church and State in France by a majority of upward of a hundred, and there is no doubt that the Senate, to which the measure now goes, will concur. We may therefore regard as definitely assured the abolition of the Concordat, which for a century has regulated the relations of the French Government not only to Catholics, but also to Protestants and Jews. That not only the Catholic priests and bishops, but also pastors of the Reformed (Huguenot) Church and Jewish rabbis, have since 1804 received stipends from the State is a fact somewhat overlooked, because of the vast preponderance of the Catholic element in the population of France.

Ostensibly, the abolition of the Concordat will give Catholicism in the French Republic precisely the same position that it occupies in the United States. What we undoubtedly see here is a free Church in a free State, and, nominally, it is a corresponding phenomenon that we are to behold in France. There are some minor differences that have been prescribed to the French Legislature by a sense of equity, and there is a fundamental distinction due to the fact that the structure of the French political system differs in principle from our own. The ministers of religion are not to be cast abruptly on the world to seek from laymen a support which the latter have not been accustomed to give, except indirectly, in their capacity of taxpayers. If, indeed, the Catholic, Protestant and Hebrew laity are as pious in France as they are in the United States they might be trusted to accept with alacrity and cheerfulness their new responsibilities. Some doubt upon this point, however, has been expressed by the clergy themselves, and, assuming that their apprehensions might prove well grounded, the Rouvier Cabinet has mitigated some of the harsh features of the bill as originally framed by M. COMBES.

The ownership of all churches and ecclesiastical buildings by the State is still asserted, but leases of them will be granted to associations locally corresponding to parishes. These units may be grouped to form larger associations, which by lease may acquire the right to occupy cathedrals and other diocesan edifices. Moreover, the stipends hitherto received from the Government will continue to be paid to the existing members of the Catholic priesthood and episcopate, and also, of course, to those Protestant pastors and Jewish rabbis who have been dependent on the treasury for their salaries. No additions to the lists of stipendiaries, however, will be recognized by the State. All new priests, ministers and rabbis will have to look to their congregations for their maintenance. For awhile, therefore, the public worship budget will undergo no material abatement, but as time goes on and the present

generation of the clergy passes away the Government appropriation for religious purposes will shrink to the vanishing point. Then, but not till then, shall we witness in France, so far as the payment of stipends is concerned, that absolute divorce of religion from the civil power with which we are familiar in this country.

From another point of view, however, the situation will be profoundly different. On this side of the Atlantic any form of religion is exempt from police supervision and interference so long as it refrains from violating the State or Federal laws. Islamism might be propagated in our commonwealth with impunity, just as Mormonism is, so long as certain tenets are not reduced to practice. If a votary of either of those religions should be prosecuted it would be as a bigamist, not as a Moslem or a Mormon. That is to say, in the United States the Church is, in deed as well as word, absolutely free. It will be otherwise in France, where for upward of a hundred years has had an intensely centralized and unified form of government which, nominally autonomous, has in practice been paternal. The French have lost what habits of local self-government they ever possessed, and have been accustomed for generations to lean upon the central authority. The demand for incessant interposition renders incessant surveillance necessary, and as a result all Frenchmen, whether dwelling in cities or rural districts, find themselves involved in the meshes of police inspection and control. The "associations" to which Paris churches and cathedrals will be leased for terms of years under specified conditions will be no more exempt than are purely secular combinations from the rigorous provisions of the law concerning all associations. The civil authorities will possess, and, if they choose, may exercise at any moment, an oppressive power of interference and coercion, which may be carried to the point of closing particular churches and cathedrals, on the ground that the terms of the leases have been infringed. A Government inspired by an equitable spirit or desirous of conciliating the pious part of the community would, of course, refrain from applying such pressure; but if a Jacobin or Socialist were Premier the religious "associations" would be likely to feel the weight of his hand.

It is impossible to forecast the outcome of an event which by both its promoters and its opponents is felt to be momentous. As we have formerly pointed out, the members of the French Catholic episcopate, all of whom have been consulted on the subject, take divergent views of the future. The majority of the opinions expressed are pessimistic, and even those which are suffused with optimism seem to be based on the experience of Catholicism in the United States, where, as we have said, the political structure and the political spirit differ essentially from those of France.

Many persons regard the crop reporting activities of the Government as scarcely necessary or legitimate. Were it to retire from the field, private agencies would take up the work and perform it satisfactorily. The Government entered upon it in response to the cry "Do something for the farmer!" It is safe to say that the speculators have been benefited more than the farmers by the Government reports. Wheat would still be wheat and cotton cotton if there were no Bureau of Statistics in Washington, and the farmer is not such a fool as some politicians describe him.

The discovery of this serious breach of confidence in what was supposed to be a particularly honest and trustworthy bureau, it may be added, is not exactly a strong argument in favor of increasing the commercial activities indulged in by the Government.

As we expected, the French Chamber of Deputies has passed the bill for the separation of Church and State in France by a majority of upward of a hundred, and there is no doubt that the Senate, to which the measure now goes, will concur. We may therefore regard as definitely assured the abolition of the Concordat, which for a century has regulated the relations of the French Government not only to Catholics, but also to Protestants and Jews. That not only the Catholic priests and bishops, but also pastors of the Reformed (Huguenot) Church and Jewish rabbis, have since 1804 received stipends from the State is a fact somewhat overlooked, because of the vast preponderance of the Catholic element in the population of France.

Ostensibly, the abolition of the Concordat will give Catholicism in the French Republic precisely the same position that it occupies in the United States. What we undoubtedly see here is a free Church in a free State, and, nominally, it is a corresponding phenomenon that we are to behold in France. There are some minor differences that have been prescribed to the French Legislature by a sense of equity, and there is a fundamental distinction due to the fact that the structure of the French political system differs in principle from our own. The ministers of religion are not to be cast abruptly on the world to seek from laymen a support which the latter have not been accustomed to give, except indirectly, in their capacity of taxpayers. If, indeed, the Catholic, Protestant and Hebrew laity are as pious in France as they are in the United States they might be trusted to accept with alacrity and cheerfulness their new responsibilities. Some doubt upon this point, however, has been expressed by the clergy themselves, and, assuming that their apprehensions might prove well grounded, the Rouvier Cabinet has mitigated some of the harsh features of the bill as originally framed by M. COMBES.

The ownership of all churches and ecclesiastical buildings by the State is still asserted, but leases of them will be granted to associations locally corresponding to parishes. These units may be grouped to form larger associations, which by lease may acquire the right to occupy cathedrals and other diocesan edifices. Moreover, the stipends hitherto received from the Government will continue to be paid to the existing members of the Catholic priesthood and episcopate, and also, of course, to those Protestant pastors and Jewish rabbis who have been dependent on the treasury for their salaries. No additions to the lists of stipendiaries, however, will be recognized by the State. All new priests, ministers and rabbis will have to look to their congregations for their maintenance. For awhile, therefore, the public worship budget will undergo no material abatement, but as time goes on and the present

generation of the clergy passes away the Government appropriation for religious purposes will shrink to the vanishing point. Then, but not till then, shall we witness in France, so far as the payment of stipends is concerned, that absolute divorce of religion from the civil power with which we are familiar in this country.

From another point of view, however, the situation will be profoundly different. On this side of the Atlantic any form of religion is exempt from police supervision and interference so long as it refrains from violating the State or Federal laws. Islamism might be propagated in our commonwealth with impunity, just as Mormonism is, so long as certain tenets are not reduced to practice. If a votary of either of those religions should be prosecuted it would be as a bigamist, not as a Moslem or a Mormon. That is to say, in the United States the Church is, in deed as well as word, absolutely free. It will be otherwise in France, where for upward of a hundred years has had an intensely centralized and unified form of government which, nominally autonomous, has in practice been paternal. The French have lost what habits of local self-government they ever possessed, and have been accustomed for generations to lean upon the central authority. The demand for incessant interposition renders incessant surveillance necessary, and as a result all Frenchmen, whether dwelling in cities or rural districts, find themselves involved in the meshes of police inspection and control. The "associations" to which Paris churches and cathedrals will be leased for terms of years under specified conditions will be no more exempt than are purely secular combinations from the rigorous provisions of the law concerning all associations. The civil authorities will possess, and, if they choose, may exercise at any moment, an oppressive power of interference and coercion, which may be carried to the point of closing particular churches and cathedrals, on the ground that the terms of the leases have been infringed. A Government inspired by an equitable spirit or desirous of conciliating the pious part of the community would, of course, refrain from applying such pressure; but if a Jacobin or Socialist were Premier the religious "associations" would be likely to feel the weight of his hand.

It is impossible to forecast the outcome of an event which by both its promoters and its opponents is felt to be momentous. As we have formerly pointed out, the members of the French Catholic episcopate, all of whom have been consulted on the subject, take divergent views of the future. The majority of the opinions expressed are pessimistic, and even those which are suffused with optimism seem to be based on the experience of Catholicism in the United States, where, as we have said, the political structure and the political spirit differ essentially from those of France.

Many persons regard the crop reporting activities of the Government as scarcely necessary or legitimate. Were it to retire from the field, private agencies would take up the work and perform it satisfactorily. The Government entered upon it in response to the cry "Do something for the farmer!" It is safe to say that the speculators have been benefited more than the farmers by the Government reports. Wheat would still be wheat and cotton cotton if there were no Bureau of Statistics in Washington, and the farmer is not such a fool as some politicians describe him.

The discovery of this serious breach of confidence in what was supposed to be a particularly honest and trustworthy bureau, it may be added, is not exactly a strong argument in favor of increasing the commercial activities indulged in by the Government.

ASIA FOR THE ASIATICS.

The Feeling of India Described by an Educated Hindu.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: I have been much interested, since coming to this part of the world three years ago, in the articles which have appeared in THE SUN under the title "No General Asiatic Spirit." In reply to a remark in which it was alleged that the name of the Mikado was "whispered with mysterious reverence" in India and Turkestan alike, and that "all differences of creed are sunk under the electrifying influence of racial gratitude and pride," the writer (Mr. Crosby) is perfectly right in bringing out the fact that any idea of a solidarity of race feeling has no basis in Asia as a whole. I speak from knowledge gathered from private letters and newspaper news sent me every week from India, that there is no such "mysterious reverence" for the Mikado in that land.

The present war and the victorious career of Japan in it have shown to the various races of India only the great possibilities that are in store for Asiatic races if they will successfully master the principles of material progress and assimilate the methods of European warfare. Japanese victories have heightened India's respect for Japan in a limited sense, as being successful adapters and shrewd users of the products of Western civilization. The world's opinion of the probability of a Mikado worship in India, for India is already overburdened with more gods than the Hindu caste to look after.

A Japanese gentleman writing to a New York paper some time since commented on the fact